

REMARKS

This is to note that the substance of the present Amendment was originally forwarded to the PTO on July 25, 2008. Subsequently, in response to a Restriction Requirement issued by the PTO three months later, on October 27, 2008, Claims 8 and 10-15 were elected. Then, three months later a Notice of Noncompliant Amendment dated February 4, 2009, and directed to the Amendment of July 25, 2008, was received requiring that a deletion in the Specification of the word "are" must be double bracketed instead of the inadvertent single bracket that occurred in that Amendment of July 25, 2008. That Notice of Noncompliant Amendment was responded to on March 4, 2009, whereupon, on May 20, 2009 a subsequent Notice of Noncompliant Amendment was received pointing out that the word "in" had been left out of a correction, although that word was present in the Amendment dated July 25, 2008. Also, it was pointed out that Claim 9, although amended in the July 25, 2008 Amendment, was later subject to restriction and should be listed as withdrawn because it was not elected in response to the Restriction Requirement. Also, a deletion in Claim 11 has been corrected.

In any event, it is believed that the amendments requested herein are in good form.

In the last Office Action on the merits, dated April 25, 2008, Figs. 1, 2, and 10, of the drawings were objected to for including nomenclature which was not referred to in the Specification. In response, Applicant has submitted herewith Replacement Sheets for Figs. 2 and 10 wherein the reference numerals 7, 25, respectively have been deleted from those drawings. With reference to Fig. 1, which was objected to for including the legend "MEMO CLK, Applicant has amended the Specification to refer to that term. Accordingly, it is believed that the drawings are now in good form.

Next, page 8 of the Specification was objected to for including a typographical error, wherein that error has been corrected in the foregoing amendment.

Referring now to the claims, it is noted that Claims 8-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for omitting certain cooperative relationships between various terms thereof. by this response, however, each one of the objectionable terms has been remedied.

All of the claims were also rejected as being anticipated by the disclosure of the cited Hiroki patent for the reasons set forth in paragraph 18 of the Office Action. In this regard, it is believed that the claims as now presented, in amended form, are patentably distinct over the disclosure of the Hiroki patent for the following reasons. Initially it is noted that the Office Action asserts that the cited Hiroki patent discloses first and second transfer switches in Fig. 8 of that reference. However, Applicant respectfully submits that in Fig. 8 of the Hiroki patent there is no disclosure as to a combination of a first transfer switch and a second transfer switch connected as required in Applicant's claim. Specifically, Hiroki does not disclose "a first transfer switch for connecting one signal line of the plurality of the signal lines with the first common signal line for selectively supplying the positive polarity picture signals to the one signal line, and a second transfer switch for connecting the one signal line with the second common signal line for selectively supplying the negative polarity picture signals to the one signal line, wherein the one signal line is connected to the first transfer switch."

For these various reasons it is believed that Claims 8-15 as now presented are allowable, wherefore the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3444116v1